



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,911	07/07/2003	Hiroshi Tone	239832US3CONT	4319

22850 7590 03/16/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

ROANE, AARON F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3739

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	Application No. 10/612,911	Applicant(s) TONE ET AL.	
	Examiner Aaron Roane	Art Unit 3739	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 8-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 8-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 23 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 2 of claim 23, the term "calcium thoglycolate" is recited. The examiner recommends changing "calcium thoglycolate" to --calcium thioglycolate--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by

Art Unit: 3739

raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949).

- In the present instance, claim 17 recites the broad recitation “includes at least one of a blood circulation enhancer, a swelling reduction agent, a slimming agent, a painkiller, a moisture retaining agent, a peeling agent, a depilating agent, and an autonomic regulating agent”, and the claim also recites “the at least one blood circulation enhancer includes at least one of acidic mucopolysaccharides, chamomile, horse chestnut, ginkgo, hamamelis extract, vitamin E, nicotinic acid derivatives, and alkaloid compounds” which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.
- In the present instance, claim 18 recites the broad recitation “includes at least one of a blood circulation enhancer, a swelling reduction agent, a slimming agent, a painkiller, a moisture retaining agent, a peeling agent, a depilating agent, and an autonomic regulating agent”, and the claim also recites “the at least one swelling reduction agent includes at least one of horse chestnut, flavone derivatives, naphthalenesulfonic acid derivatives, anthocyanins,

Art Unit: 3739

vitamin P, calendula officinalis, concholytic acid, silanol, Terminalia, Visnaga, and Majus” which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

- In the present instance, claim 19 recites the broad recitation “includes at least one of a blood circulation enhancer, a swelling reduction agent, a slimming agent, a painkiller, a moisture retaining agent, a peeling agent, a depilating agent, and an autonomic regulating agent”, and the claim also recites “the at least one slimming agent includes at least one of aminophylline, tea extract, caffeine, xanthine derivatives, inositol, dextranulfuric acid derivatives, horse chestnut, aescin, anthocyanadin, organoiodine compounds, Hypericlm erectum, Spiraea japonica, Equisetum arvense, Rosmarinus officinalis, gingsen, Hedera rhombea, thomucase, and hyaluronidase” which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.
- In the present instance, claim 20 recites the broad recitation “includes at least one of a blood circulation enhancer, a swelling reduction agent, a slimming agent, a painkiller, a moisture retaining agent, a peeling agent, a depilating agent, and an autonomic regulating agent”, and the claim also recites “the at least one painkiller includes at least one of indometacin, diclofenac, dl-camphor, flurbiprofen, ketoprofen, cayenne pepper extract, piroxicam, felbinac, methyl salicylate, and glycol salicylate” which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

- In the present instance, claim 21 recites the broad recitation “includes at least one of a blood circulation enhancer, a swelling reduction agent, a slimming agent, a painkiller, a moisture retaining agent, a peeling agent, a depilating agent, and an autonomic regulating agent”, and the claim also recites “the at least one moisture retaining agent includes a polyol” which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.
- In the present instance, claim 22 recites the broad recitation “includes at least one of a blood circulation enhancer, a swelling reduction agent, a slimming agent, a painkiller, a moisture retaining agent, a peeling agent, a depilating agent, and an autonomic regulating agent”, and the claim also recites “the at least one peeling agent includes at least a protease” which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.
- In the present instance, claim 23 recites the broad recitation “includes at least one of a blood circulation enhancer, a swelling reduction agent, a slimming agent, a painkiller, a moisture retaining agent, a peeling agent, a depilating agent, and an autonomic regulating agent”, and the claim also recites “the at least one depilating agent includes calcium thoglycolate” which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Art Unit: 3739

- In the present instance, claim 23 recites the broad recitation “includes at least one of a blood circulation enhancer, a swelling reduction agent, a slimming agent, a painkiller, a moisture retaining agent, a peeling agent, a depilating agent, and an autonomic regulating agent”, and the claim also recites “the at least one autonomic regulating agent includes γ -oryzanol” which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim 16 only positively recites the group of blood circulation enhancer, a swelling reduction agent, a slimming agent, a painkiller, a moisture retaining agent, a peeling agent, a depilating agent, and an autonomic regulating agent and therefore the recitations of claims 17-24 further limit a specific element that has not been positively recited. However, in order to provide an initial examination, the examiner will ignore the improper format of claims 17-24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002

Art Unit: 3739

do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 6 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Igaki et al. (USPN 6,409,746 B1).

Regarding claim 6, Igaki et al. disclose a steam generator comprising a steam-generating composition and a paper sheet (4b), the steam-generating composition including a metal powder, a salt, and water and adapted to discharge steam as the metal powder is oxidized, and an adhesive layer (7) provided on a surface of the steam generator adapted to be applied to at least one of skin or mucosa of a user of the steam generator, see abstract, col. 2-16 and figures 1A-6B.

Regarding claims 10 and 11, Igaki et al. disclose the disclosed permeability requirements of the various layers that meet the claimed invention, see col. 4, lines 10-25, col. 5, lines 46-67 and more particularly, starting on col. 10, line 61 and ending on col. 11, line 9.

Regarding 12, Igaki et al. disclose the claimed invention, see col. 3, lines 35-51.

Art Unit: 3739

Regarding claim 13, Igaki et al. disclose the claimed invention, see col. 4, lines 10-25, col. 5, lines 46-67 and more particularly, starting on col. 10, line 61 and ending on col. 11, line 9.

Regarding claim 14, Igaki et al. further disclose at least one opening guiding the steam discharged from the steam generation portion is provided in the adhesive layer and impermeable layer, col. 2-16 and figures 1A-6B.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8, 9, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igaki et al. (USPN 6,409,746 B1) in view of Usui (USPN 5,879,378).

Regarding claim 8, Igaki et al. disclose the claimed invention except for explicitly reciting the steam generating composition is integrated with the paper sheet. Usui discloses an exothermic application pad and teaches the use of a steam generation portion formed into a laminate structure by placing exothermic composition on paper in order to

enhance feel and conformability, to prevent movement of exothermic composition inside the pouch and provide availability in the medical field in the future, see col. 3-6.

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Igaki et al., as taught by Usui, to use a steam generation portion formed into a sheet (by placing exothermic composition on paper) in order to enhance feel and conformability, to prevent movement of exothermic composition inside the pouch and provide availability in the medical field in the future.

Regarding claim 9, Igaki et al. are silent as to whether or not the adhesive layer comprises a water soluble substrate. Usui discloses an exothermic application pad and teaches the use of an acrylic adhesive in order to provide the desired cohesion or tackiness, see col. 15-20. Since Applicant asserts on page 17, last paragraph, lines 4-9, that acrylic adhesives serve as a water-soluble adhesive, Igaki et al. in view of Usui meet the claimed invention. Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Igaki et al., as taught by Usui, to use an acrylic adhesive in order to provide the desired cohesion or tackiness.

Regarding claim 15, Igaki et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the adhesive layer includes at least one of a cosmetic and a pharmaceutical component. Usui discloses an exothermic application pad and teaches including a cosmetic or pharmaceutical component in the adhesive layer in order to improve a local therapeutic effect, see claim 23 and col. 14, lines 26-60. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been

Art Unit: 3739

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Igaki et al., as taught by Usui, to include a cosmetic or pharmaceutical component in the adhesive layer in order to improve a local therapeutic effect.

Regarding claim 16, Igaki et al. in view of Usui disclose the claimed invention, see Usui col. 14, lines 26-60.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igaki et al. (USPN 6,409,746 B1) in view of Usui (USPN 5,879,378) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Kamiyama (USPN 6,669,953 B1).

Regarding claim 17, Igaki et al. in view of Usui disclose the claimed invention except for reciting the use an adhesive layer that includes at least one of acidic mucopolysaccharides, chamomile, horse chestnut, ginkgo, hamamelis extract, vitamin E, nicotinic acid derivatives, and alkaloid compounds. Kamiyama discloses a drug delivery patch comprising an adhesive layer and teaches that the adhesive layer may contain vitamin E in order to increase its adhesive properties, see col. 4, line 60 through col. 5, line 2. Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify the invention of Igaki et al. in view of Usui, to use an adhesive layer that contains vitamin E in order to increase its adhesive properties.

Art Unit: 3739

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igaki et al. (USPN 6,409,746 B1) in view of Usui (USPN 5,879,378) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Betrabet et al. (USPN 5,618,281).

Regarding claim 18, Igaki et al. in view of Usui disclose the claimed invention except for reciting the use an adhesive layer that includes at least one of horse chestnut, flavone derivatives, naphthalenesulfonic acid derivatives, anthocyanins, vitamin P, calendula officinalis, concholytic acid, silanol, Terminalia, Visnaga, and Majus. Betrabet et al. disclose a polysiloxane adhesive composition that is useful in attaching products to human skin and teach the use of silanol in the adhesive in order to induce crosslinking to prepare the desired polysiloxane adhesive composition and improve desired adhesive properties, see col. 2-3. Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Igaki et al. in view of Usui, as taught by Betrabet et al., to use silanol in the adhesive in order to induce crosslinking to prepare the desired polysiloxane adhesive composition and improve desired adhesive properties.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igaki et al. (USPN 6,409,746 B1) in view of Usui (USPN 5,879,378) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Hoffman et al. (USPN 6,190,389 B1).

Regarding claim 19, Igaki et al. in view of Usui disclose the claimed invention except for reciting the use an adhesive layer that includes at least one of aminophylline, tea extract, caffeine, xanthine derivatives, inositol, dextran-sulfuric acid derivatives, horse chestnut, aescin, anthocyanadin, organoiodine compounds, Hypericum erectum, Spiraea japonica, Equisetum arvense, Rosmarinus officinalis, ginseng, Hedera rhombica, thrombolytic, and hyaluronidase. Hoffman et al. disclose a therapeutic device comprising hydrophilic pressure sensitive adhesive and teach the use of adhesives containing horse chestnut in order to treat contusions, distortions and/or hemorrhages or tea extracts in order to treat the circulatory system, see col. 4, line 57 through col. 5, line 16. Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Igaki et al. in view of Usui, as taught by Hoffman et al., to use adhesives containing horse chestnut in order to treat contusions, distortions and/or hemorrhages or tea extracts in order to treat the circulatory system.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igaki et al. (USPN 6,409,746 B1) in view of Usui (USPN 5,879,378) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Effing et al. (USPN 6,193,996 B1).

Regarding claim 20, Igaki et al. in view of Usui disclose the claimed invention except for reciting the use an adhesive layer that includes at least one of indometacin, diclofenac, dl-camphor, flurbiprofen, ketoprofen, cayenne pepper extract, piroxicam, felbinac, methyl salicylate, and glycol salicylate. Effing et al. disclose a therapeutic device for the

Art Unit: 3739

transdermal delivery of diclofenac and teach the use of adhesives containing diclofenac in order to improve the transdermal delivery of diclofenac for the treatment of inflammation of pain relief, see col. 2. Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Igaki et al. in view of Usui, as taught by Effing et al., to use adhesives containing diclofenac in order to improve the transdermal delivery of diclofenac for the treatment of inflammation of pain relief.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igaki et al. (USPN 6,409,746 B1) in view of Usui (USPN 5,879,378) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Basedow et al. (USPN 6,198,017 B1).

Regarding claim 21, Igaki et al. in view of Usui disclose the claimed invention except for reciting the use an adhesive layer that includes polyol. Basedow et al. disclose medical pressure-sensitive adhesives and teach the use of adhesives containing polyol in order to provide improved adhesion to dry, moist and wet skin, see col. 1, line 43 through col. 2, line 65. Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Igaki et al. in view of Usui, as taught by Basedow et al., to use adhesives containing polyol in order to provide improved adhesion to dry, moist and wet skin.

Art Unit: 3739

Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igaki et al.

(USPN 6,409,746 B1) in view of Usui (USPN 5,879,378) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Tsutsumi (USPN 6,841,716 B1).

Regarding claim 23, Igaki et al. in view of Usui disclose the claimed invention except for reciting the use an adhesive layer that includes polyol. Tsutsumi discloses a device having an adhesive layer and teach the use of adding calcium thioglycolate to serve as an absorption accelerator of the pressure sensitive adhesive in order to improve the penetration of a drug through the skin, see col. 4, lines 10-52. Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Igaki et al. in view of Usui, as taught by Tsutsumi, to use calcium thioglycolate to serve as an absorption accelerator of the pressure sensitive adhesive in order to improve the penetration of a drug through the skin.

Regarding claim 24, Igaki et al. in view of Usui in further view of Tsutsumi disclose the claimed invention except for explicitly reciting that adhesive layer contains an autonomic regulating agent that includes γ -oryzanol. Tsutsumi does however disclose that autonomic agents are combined with the pressure sensitive adhesive whenever a pressure sensitive adhesive is combined with a drug to achieve a desired effect, see col. 4, lines 38-53. At the time of the invention, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art to specifically use γ -oryzanol as an autonomic regulating agent because Applicant has not disclosed γ -oryzanol provides an advantage,

Art Unit: 3739

is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem over other autonomic regulating agents. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with any of a wide variety of autonomic regulating agents as opposed to the specific use of γ -oryzanol, because they both produce the same desired effect.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igaki et al. (USPN 6,409,746 B1) in view of Usui (USPN 5,879,378) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Kuratomi et al. (USPN 4,747,841).

Regarding claim 25, Igaki et al. in view of Usui disclose the claimed invention except for reciting the adhesive layer covers approximately 50% to approximately 99.9% of a surface to which the steam generator is applied. Kuratomi et al. disclose a heat generating composition that heats and vaporizes herb material and teach the inclusion of the adhesive layer (8) with many ventilating holes in order to allow the vapor generated from the herb material to act on the skin, see col.3, lines 14-25, col. 4, lines 31-49 and figure 3. The embodiments disclosed by Kuratomi et al. certainly meet the recitation that the adhesive layer covers approximately 50% to approximately 99.9% of a surface to which the steam generator is applied. Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Igaki et al. in view of Usui, as taught by Kuratomi et al., to use calcium thioglycolate to serve as an absorption accelerator of the pressure sensitive adhesive in order to include an adhesive

layer with many ventilating holes and that covers approximately 50% to approximately 99.9% of a surface to which the steam generator is applied in order to allow the vapor generated from the herb material to act on the skin.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 22 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Additionally, Usui is silent as to the application of steam, vapor, mist and/or moisture to the treatment area. However, there is no positive recitation that the steam generated is delivered to the skin of the wearer. Although operational characteristics of an apparatus may be apparent from the specification, we will not read such characteristics into the claims when they cannot be fairly connected to the structure recited in the claims. See *In re Self*, 671 F.2d 1344, 1348, 213 USPQ 1, 5 (CCPA 1982).

This office action is FINAL.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Roane whose telephone number is (571) 272-4771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3739

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A.R. *A. R.*
March 14, 2005

Roy D. Gibson
ROY D. GIBSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER